

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-20 have been amended, and support for the amendments is found in original Claims 1-20. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Zalewski (International Publication No. WO 02/11074-A2, herein Zalewski); and Claims 2-6, 10, 13, 14, and 17-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the early indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2-6, 10, 13, 14, and 17-19. Since the Applicants believe independent Claims 1, 9, 12, and 16 patentably distinguish over the cited references of record, Claims 2-6, 10, 13, 14, and 17-19 have been maintained in dependent form.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a mobile communication terminal including the following:

means for receiving a switching signal for switching among a plurality of modes comprising an identification information received mode **activating only the means for receiving identification information**, and a cellular communication mode **activating only the means for communicating**, and for performing a mode switching control based on the received switching signal. (emphasis added)

As described in the background section of the specification, simply providing a mobile communication terminal with an RFID information receiving function can cause problems such as unnecessary power consumption, increases in the traffic of a cellular

communication network, and additional charges.¹ Accordingly, independent Claim 1 includes a switching control means for switching between an identification information receive mode “activating only the means for receiving identification information” and a cellular communication mode “activating only the means for communicating.” Therefore, the mobile communication terminal of amended Claim 1 provides the ability to use the identification information receive mode and the cellular communication mode individually, thereby reducing power consumption, traffic on the cellular communication network, and cost. Amended independent Claims 9, 12, 16, and 20 recite features related to switching between a plurality of modes as described above with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

Zalewski is directed to an electronic device cover with an embedded radio frequency transponder for use in a payment system. The cover, used to cover a mobile phone, provides an electronic identification number and other information in response to an EM field created by reader/interrogator.² Zalewski describes that the “reader/interrogator may also send a code to a register of MCU instructing phone to go to passive mode. However, Zalewski does not disclose switching to “a cellular communication mode of activating only the means for communicating.” Accordingly, the cover described in Zalewski attached to a cell phone possesses the same problems as described above with respect to simply providing cell phones with an RFID receiving function. Since Zalewski does not disclose the ability to send a signal or code to deactivate the transponder of changeable cover, attaching the changeable cover in Zalewski would result in unnecessary power consumption, increases in the traffic of a cellular communication network, and additional charges. To deactivate the transponder and the changeable cover of Zalewski, the changeable cover must be physically removed from the cell phone by the user.

¹ Applicant specification, page 2, lines 8-21.

² Zalewski, page 15, line 31 to page 16, line 21.


Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Zalewski fails to disclose switching between a plurality of modes based on a received switching signal, wherein one of the modes is “a cellular communication mode **activating only the means for communication**,” as recited in amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Zalewski, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection to independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

Likewise, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 9, 12, 16, and 20 patentably distinguish over Zalewski at least because of the claimed features that are similar to the above-identified feature of amended Claim 1. Therefore, it is also respectfully requested that the rejection to independent Claims 9, 12, 16, and 20 also be withdrawn. Further, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2-8, 10, 11, 13-15, and 17-19 are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 20.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in this application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\SAE\PROSECUTION\24'S\246427US\246427US-AM.DOC